

Continuation of Interview

Attorney intimated that in claim 1, the S-CSCF recording of SIP request message referred to the storing of the SIP request message and the prior art did not reflect this limitation. Examiner indicated that this limitation was not stated as such in the specification. Also, attorney stated that the S-CSCF examining the SIP response message was prosecuted as a request message. Told same that this limitation was prosecuted on the basis that with a request message there would be a response. Further, attorney stated that the prior art reference of Shaheen et al. did not show filter criteria, and that a proposed amendment would be filed to skip the filtering of SIP message. Same will contact the client on how to proceed with the application.

LA/la
July 23, 2009